

<sup>4</sup> *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir.), *on reh'g*, 753 F.2d 1081 (9th Cir. 1984).

1 Brady suggests), and the screening orders in the two cases have created an even greater divide  
2 between them, leaving the cases with different theories, claims, and defendants.<sup>5</sup> These  
3 differences will require Brady and Guardado to present different evidence to prove their claims.  
4 Accordingly, I do not find that consolidation or joinder would be economical in this case.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Brady's Motion to Consolidate [ECF No. 15] is  
6 **DENIED**. However, because judicial economy would be served by having both cases heard by  
7 the same magistrate and district judge, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **the Clerk of Court is**  
8 **directed to reassign this case to Magistrate Judge Ferenbach**, who is presiding over  
9 Guardado's earlier-filed case (2:17-cv-1072-JAD-VCF).

10 Dated: April 3, 2019

11   
12 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 <sup>5</sup> See ECF No. 51 in 2:17-cv-1072-JAD-VCF (incorporated herein and describing the material differences in greater detail).